DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 282 SP 037 395

AUTHOR Pugach, Marleen C.; And Others
TITLE The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee's Collaborative Teacher Education Program for Urban Communities.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Educational Change; Elementary Education; Higher Education; *Inclusive Schools; Mainstreaming; Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Development; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Special Education; Teacher Collaboration; *Teacher Education Programs; Urban Education; *Urban Teaching
IDENTIFIERS *Milwaukee Public Schools WI; Reform Efforts; *University of Wisconsin Milwaukee

ABSTRACT

The reform of teacher education at The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has proceeded from a collective commitment to developing a unified framework for the preparation of early childhood, primary/middle, and special education teachers for urban schools. The new program, Collaborative Teacher Education for Urban Communities, integrates preparation for working with students with disabilities into the early childhood and primary/middle level programs in general education, while moving the preparation of special educators to a fifth year, or postbaccalaurate only program. Certification at the primary/middle level in the new program covers grades 1-8, with a specialization at either the primary or middle level; preparation for bilingual education is added onto regular primary/middle certification. The program is based on the belief that preparing teachers for urban schools is qualitatively different from preparing teachers for any school, and requires a high level of collaboration. Considerable attention has been directed toward the integration and redefinition of faculty and student roles as the collaborative program has developed. The knowledge base, which emanates from the core values that have been adopted, and various themes related to urban and inclusive education are integrated in blocks of courses and field experiences. Information on core values, standards for teacher development and licensure, program organization and design features, and a figure depicting the emerging coordinating structure are appended. (JT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 409 282

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE'S COLLABORATIVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR URBAN COMMUNITIES

Marleen C. Pugach
Judith Winn
Alison Ford
Mary Jett-Simpson

School of Education
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Pugach

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Paper presented as part of a Symposium on Innovative Approaches for Preparing General and Special Educators, Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, Chicago, March 25, 1997

For copies contact:
Marleen C. Pugach (414-229-6071 or mpugach@csd.uwm.edu)
Judith Winn (414-229-4109 or jwinn@csd.uwm.edu)

SP037395

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The reform of teacher education at The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has proceeded from a collective commitment to developing a unified framework for the preparation of good beginning teachers for urban schools. Entitled ***Collaborative Teacher Education for Urban Communities***, the new program design has emerged as a common ground for the preparation of teachers across early childhood, primary/middle, and special education. The new program integrates preparation for working with students with disabilities as members of a teaching team into the early childhood and primary/middle level programs in general education while moving the preparation of special educators to a fifth year, or postbaccalaureate only program. Certification at the primary/middle level in the new program covers grades 1-8, with a specialization at either the primary or middle level; preparation for bilingual education, a high area of need in Milwaukee, is added on to regular primary/middle certification. Both general and special teacher education programs are anchored in: a sound understanding of the urban context; a developmental perspective on children's growth and learning; the acceptance of and support for all children, including those with disabilities, as full classroom members; the need to work effectively within a collaborative team structure; the critical role of academic content as foundational knowledge for good teaching and especially for good interdisciplinary teaching; the need to advocate thoughtfully for children and for educational reform; the role of networking with families and community agencies in providing appropriate support for children's learning in urban schools; and the need for teachers to be thoughtful, inquiring professionals who continue to develop throughout their careers. Within this framework, we see general classroom and special education teachers bringing complementary expertise to the challenges of urban teaching. These themes reflect our commitments and provide a framework within which preservice students can

view their responsibilities and also form a set of professional expectations for their work in schools.

Collaborative Teacher Education for Urban Communities is based on the belief that preparing teachers for urban schools is qualitatively different than preparing teachers for "any" school. To meet the complex needs of urban children and youth, the collective expertise of professionals in general and special education, family members, agency personnel and other community members will be required. Such collaboration is also critical to meeting the needs of students with disabilities as they are increasingly integrated into general education classrooms. We wish to foster a deep understanding on the part of our preservice students that children in urban schools possess tremendous assets that should form the foundation for their learning, but at the same time bring with them serious challenges reflecting the complexity of their lives. The special work of urban teachers is to identify and value the knowledge and skills children already possess and use both to foster high levels of learning and to address the challenges students face. In particular, if we are to be sure that urban students are not inappropriately labeled as having disabilities, but that those who do indeed have disabilities are properly served, teachers will need to be prepared at a high level of understanding of multicultural education and special education and the relationship between the two, as well as to be highly skilled in the most appropriate and supportive methods of general education we have to offer.

The term "collaborative" in the title also underscores our commitment to strong school-university partnerships. The program has been designed with essential fieldwork components each semester; these include working with children with disabilities for all teacher education students. Our goal is to ensure that our students have increasingly intensive experiences that build

on one another sequentially, rather than a series of "introductory" experiences each semester. Most important, the program is designed to link the various field experiences and coursework intentionally in both the liberal arts and sciences and education as a means of strengthening the preparation of our prospective graduates.

To this end, professors in the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction and Exceptional Education spearheaded efforts to reach conceptual agreement on what it means to prepare urban teachers. Over a two year period, a group of faculty from these departments met voluntarily to focus on program reform.[1] Cochaired by two professors, one from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and one from the Department of Exceptional Education, the effort expanded to include broad involvement across these departments, as well as the involvement of faculty in Educational Policy and Community Studies, Educational Psychology, and Administrative Leadership who work with or are interested in the preparation of prospective teachers. This structure for our work continues as we have entered the implementation phase. We continue to hold monthly meetings, retreats, work sessions, ad hoc work groups, and ongoing faculty development activities, with active participation from a core group of 20-25 faculty and advising staff.

We have regularly sought input from our colleagues across the School of Education, from parents, teachers, and administrators from area schools, from other departments in the university, and from current and former UWM students who are knowledgeable about our existing programs.

---

[1]An extended description of the phases of development of the Collaborative Program appears in A. H. Hains, C. B. Maxwell, L. Tiezzi, M. J. Simpson, A. Ford, and M. C. Pugach, "From individual and ambiguous to collaborative and explicit: Reform in urban teacher education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee," in L. P. Blanton, C. C. Griffin, J. A. Winn, and M. C. Pugach (Eds.), (1997), **Teacher education in transition** (pp. 180-206), Denver: Love Publishing Company.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We have openly shared our progress and thinking on an ongoing basis. Once the core values and basic design features of the program were developed, there were (and continue to be) times when department work groups meet alone to accomplish tasks and then report progress to and get feedback from the larger group. In other words, we don't "do" everything together, but we do expect that everyone is aware of what is going on in the rest of the programs as an important source of knowledge for their own teaching. As a working group, we hope the values we bring to this program development effort are reflected back in the values we see as integral to the teacher education programs themselves. For example, our deliberations have operated based on collegial sharing, open dialogue, self-reflection, a respect for differences, and our own ongoing professional growth and development as faculty members. We study, argue, and come to decisions together. We believe that many of us have important contributions to make to the preparation of teachers for urban schools, but that those contributions are maximized only when they occur within a unified framework for teacher preparation and not as isolated experiences.

We have strived to create a healthy sense of interdependence in the large working group and among the smaller working groups as well. There is ample room for disagreement, but the goal is collegial resolution as we keep in mind the ultimate purpose of our efforts, namely, to improve the educational experiences of children and youth in urban schools by providing them with a cadre of new teachers who themselves are committed and well prepared to meet this goal.

Teacher education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has always been committed to the preparation of teachers for urban schools. But, like our peer teacher education programs nationwide, prior to this reform effort, we mostly offered teacher education programs in early childhood education, elementary education, and special education that were only loosely related

to one another. Programs at UWM operated with a high degree of autonomy and as a loose collection of courses. Depending on which instructor taught the course and based on the underlying assumption that the students themselves would be successful at integrating the knowledge from these courses and traditional field experiences themselves, we talked only incidentally about the programs as a whole. Under this structure, we offered programs in early childhood and elementary 1-6 (with middle school certification as an add-on) at both the undergraduate and postbaccalaureate levels, and single categorical special education programs at both the undergraduate and postbaccalaureate levels. Early childhood and early childhood special education worked closely together, but the programs were not fully integrated. Courses taught by our colleagues in, for example, learning and development or cultural foundations were seen as "service" courses to the teacher education program rather than an integral part of them. A course in mainstreaming had traditionally been required for all teacher education students, and students preparing for special education completed a required practicum in regular education accompanied by a seminar. In general, the traditional program was an additive model, with each new state requirement resulting in the rush to add a new course, and program that ostensibly were designed as undergraduate ranging from 128-153 credits.

Other reform efforts have preceded our work in UWM's School of Education and elsewhere and wherever appropriate we have drawn on them. This includes local work done on developing a knowledge base for preparing education professionals for urban school, prior development work in the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction and Exceptional Education, the work of UWM's Center for Teacher Education in the late 1980's and early 1990's, efforts to integrate early childhood and early childhood special education, and the state of Wisconsin's

efforts to restructure teacher licensing through the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).

Implementation of ***Collaborative Teacher Education for Urban Communities*** began with the new post baccalaureate only option for special education certification in the summer of 1996; undergraduate certification in special education is being phased out with the beginning of this program. At the time of this writing, the new primary/middle program has been approved at the institutional level and is moving through the approval process at the state levels, with an anticipated implementation date of fall 1998. In the interim, various parts of the new program design are being piloted. As with the "old" program, the new primary/middle program will admit both undergraduate and postbaccalaureate students. The new early childhood program will be the final segment to be implemented.

Integration and Redefinition of Roles

The roles of both the teachers we are preparing, and the teacher education faculty, are being redefined in the Collaborative Program. In both cases, the roles involve working together to share expertise and to frame our work--at the university and in the schools alike--under collective, mutually held goals. While the new roles involve, in a sense, a loss of autonomy and defined boundaries, they are also providing avenues through which expertise can be combined in a powerful, concerted manner. Redefining these roles is key to maintaining a focus on the agreed upon core values that drive the program.

Both general and special education teachers are being prepared to work as team members, with each member bringing a high level of knowledge to the work of educating students with and without disabilities. Initially, our thinking moved in the direction of dual certification in general

and special education for all of our graduates. As our work proceeded, however, we came to question whether in a 4-year program we could realistically prepare students for the extensive knowledge dual certification demanded. Even more importantly, we came to question the complete interchangeability of the roles of general and special education teachers, realizing the value when each kind of teacher brings unique and differential knowledge and skills to his or her work in the schools--rather than everyone making the same contribution.

In collaborative endeavors, both general and special education teachers bring a strong commitment to, and knowledge about, preventing unnecessary classification of urban students as needing special education. This means they must have a high level of understanding and skill about how to meet the needs of students who are now regularly misclassified as having mild disabilities, but who may in fact need their general education teachers to provide structured learning experiences in the classroom to support their success as learners. General and special education teachers must also both accept responsibility for meeting the needs of students who have significant learning, developmental, and emotional/behavioral challenges. Accepting this responsibility on the part of general classroom teachers means that they invite and support all students as members of their classroom communities, but at the same time recognize that for some students, there will be unique knowledge that will have to be tended to by a special education teacher. The special educator's role, as we define it, is to offer a higher level of expertise about students with disabilities in a manner that is closely integrated with, rather than decontextualized from, general education. This means that prospective special education teachers are to have a working knowledge of the regular curriculum as the basis for their work adapting and modifying learning experiences for students with disabilities. To this end, we have turned

away from our original plan to offer dual certification as the standard 4-year program and have designed the special education certification program as a fifth year, post-baccalaureate extension of the general teacher education program.

Paralleling these redefined roles for teachers are new roles for faculty. Redefining faculty roles is vital to supporting the preparation of teachers who are both committed and prepared to educate a diverse group of learners as well as to provide specialized instruction for those who do need it. Faculty across departments have worked together in new roles in all phases of the planning, and now the implementation, of ***Collaborative Teacher Education for Urban Communities***.

Each workgroup in the planning structure includes members from across departments. In several cases, the workgroups are led by faculty in departments other than Curriculum and Instruction. At this point, the workgroups for program blocks are engaged in the task of specifically defining the performances students will be asked to demonstrate as they complete each block, and the nature of the course content/activities and field experiences to support those outcomes. Each block workgroup, in turn, is sharing its work with that of the other blocks for further clarification and to ensure a continual building and linking throughout the program. Within this sharing, each faculty member must think about his/her own work in terms of how it supports the block outcomes and how it links with, or can link with, work of previous and subsequent blocks and program themes.

The special education faculty have been working in this fashion as they implement their postbaccalaureate program. Special education primary/middle block faculty meet bi-weekly for at least two hour sessions. Monthly, the field supervisors also attend these meetings. The purposes

of our meetings are to: (1) coordinate our course goals, emphases, projects, and readings with program themes and block outcomes; (2) discuss the progress of each student in the cohort, including performance in the field; and (3) continually develop and evaluate the program. Within these meetings, courses are not seen as separate entities as much as they are seen as pieces of the block experience. As a result of this work together, special education faculty have substantially changed content, projects, readings, ways in which we approach individual students, and ways in which we use their field experiences to inform the courses. Additionally, we have come to redefine important and needed experiences in preceding and subsequent blocks. This kind of interaction is meant to occur throughout the program within and across blocks for all program emphases: special education, primary/middle, and early childhood. The lessons from the initial implementation within the postbaccalaureate special education program will be crucial to how faculty redefine their work across the three programs.

These regular interactions--at the level of program conceptualization, development, and initial implementation within special education-- have already dramatically changed the ways in which we conceptualize and carry out our work, as well as the norms which guide us. Although we still have a departmental structure, our work is clearly program based and, as such, cuts across departments. We can no longer be autonomous and isolated. Rather, our work, and the assumptions upon which it is based, have become public. Activities such as sharing syllabi and working together to frame and reframe them open us to a degree of scrutiny that many are not used to. While the sharing is exciting and provides a welcome context for individual efforts, it also can be threatening. Similarly, the joint examinations and work to develop a shared and deep understanding of issues, particularly those involved in preparing strong beginning teachers for

urban schools, challenges faculty to deal more publicly with their own perspectives on these most difficult issues. These examinations require the development of a safe community among the faculty in which everyone is willing to wrestle with hard issues, to take on the personal challenges it represents, and to make the commitment to learn what one might not understand. Participating in the discussions of the themes, and integrating them well into the entire course sequence, is not a negotiable item.

Finally, courses are to be cotaught where appropriate, and faculty wide responsibility for dynamics like admission, portfolio assessment, and program review is one of the hallmarks of our plans. This means that the staff of our advising office is integrally involved in all aspects of program development. We recognize that, once created, the program will be sustained only by collectively monitoring our own skills in delivering it, by our responsiveness to new developments in education which will require continual program revision, and by our willing commitment to high standards for our students' work and for the work we ourselves do with them. As the program is implemented, faculty will continue to meet regularly as teams--a feature that is already occurring in special education--to link all coursework and field experiences to support the program themes and outcomes.

Integrating the Knowledge Base

The knowledge base we hold as fundamental to our work in ***Collaborative Teacher Education for Urban Communities*** emanates from the core values we have adopted, the content and processes within the program itself, and the standards for beginning teachers promulgated by INTASC and which have been extended by UWM's Exceptional Education departmental faculty to begin to define a companion set of standards for the preparation of beginning special education

teachers. One of the most important premises in terms of how we have integrated the knowledge base is the assumption that all classroom teachers need to be prepared to engage in more complex forms of instruction and possess a better understanding of the context in which teaching and learning occurs, and that special education teachers possess another defensible layer of expertise that builds on these more complex foundations. Teaching in urban schools is complex work, and teachers who make this commitment require a deep understanding of the relationship between various instructional philosophies and the complicated context in which they will be used. We expect all of our graduates to be able to contextualize the structured teaching of, for example, basic skills, within a framework of meaningful instruction for comprehension and problem solving, thus moving away from the traditional arguments, such as pitting a constructivist approach against a behavioral one. We have not taken for granted what we believe either general or special education teachers ought to know and be able to do; rather, we are redefining both domains of expertise in the context of what it means to prepare good beginning urban teachers, and we continue to refine these definitions.

A second layer of integration is the integration of themes across the entire teacher education curriculum. For example, the anchor point for concepts of urban and multicultural education, which we do not treat as interchangeable, is a six credit block in Schooling and the Urban Community; this block integrates our Introduction to Teaching course (which has a field component) and our course on Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education. Our goal is twofold: to foster the development of a critical, inquiring perspective about education as well as to engage the students in understanding their own life experiences and themselves in terms of race, ethnicity, gender and language. This block precedes formal admission to the School of

Education and is also meant to serve as a departure point (rather than an endpoint) for an ongoing consideration of the structure of the educational system and the ways teachers can foster greater equity in the schools. As we develop performance assessments for each of the subsequent blocks, the question we are raising is, "What are the most meaningful ways to address issues of equity in blocks that are primarily devoted to the acquisition and practice of methods of teaching?" We are working this through as faculty teams, raising critical questions like, "What would teachers do to close the achievement gap between African-American or Hispanic students and white students in their classrooms?" "What instructional skills and methods do they need to know how to use?" In other words, the themes become screens through which we judge the depth of the work we are doing. As they should, these themes add a layer of complexity to the work of preparing teachers. Inevitably, this raises questions about how faculty members themselves define urban education and contextualize their work within it.

Similarly, the consideration of disabilities is addressed in the Schooling and the Urban Community block as a function of the structure of schooling, but is addressed at the level of individual difference in the first professional block, which focuses on the child at the center of the prospective teacher's consideration. Issues of inclusive education and the professional work of teachers is addressed in depth again at the end of the program, in a required course on collaboration. How faculty define inclusion, how familiar we all are with inclusive classrooms in the Milwaukee Public Schools (which are widespread and differ greatly), how we consider inclusion in terms of preparing our students for instructional challenges, all need to be discussed on a faculty wide basis.

We devote part of our work sessions to continued discussion of thematic issues; we are beginning to engage in joint reading regarding these issues and in serious discussions of our various positions. We find that to insure a serious integration of themes like urban education and inclusion and constructivist teaching, we must constantly and deliberately revisit them to determine what it means to address them across the span of the program. We also find that there is great danger in making the assumption that we all agree on what these two important foundational themes mean--that their very widespread use means we have to be careful in our joint understanding of what they are and are not. Engaging in ongoing dialogue around themes is perhaps the single most challenging norm to change among faculty as we redefine and integrate the knowledge base.

A third layer of integration of the knowledge base is the integration of ideas, experiences in the field, and experiences at the university through the Urban Professional Linking Seminar, which is an intentional program feature in which students and faculty work closely together to assist students in making sense of the various experiences prospective teachers at UWM are having. Linking seminar is designed to occur in each of the four professional semesters of the program and is meant to provide an opportunity to interpret problems of practice in all their complexity, to provide complex solutions, and to support students as they move back and forth from course experiences to field experiences. We anticipate utilizing case studies (both others' and our students') as an important vehicle for achieving this level of integration.

Integrating and Redefining Opportunities in the Field

Field experiences are integral to the Collaborative Program. During each professional block in both the primary/middle and special education programs, as well as during the six credit

Schooling and the Urban Community Block, students participate in field experiences. The nature of these experiences is being carefully crafted to help students understand the major concepts emphasized in each block and how these concepts relate to program themes. All professional blocks are attached to the Urban Professional Linking Seminars as a means of facilitating inquiry, reflection, and analysis.

Field experiences occur in urban schools in the Milwaukee Public School system, in which students can have opportunities to work within collaborative structures involving general and special education teachers and students. UWM has a history of partnerships with the Milwaukee Public Schools, and we intend to build on what we have learned from our past partnership work. Faculty who are developing and implementing the new program and administrators and teachers in the schools are beginning the hard work of redefining those partnerships in relationship to the new field experiences associated with each block, hoping to locate field experiences in schools that have particular interest in the activities and learnings to be emphasized during these various experiences.

These partnerships are framed around the belief that the preparation of new teachers, the ongoing professional development of practicing teachers, and the improvement of urban schools are inextricably linked. In this way, the partnerships we hope to develop resonate with the underlying principles associated with the professional development school, or professional practice school, model. We plan to have school-based personnel take active roles in the Linking Seminars and to participate regularly on faculty teams. Cooperating teachers and university block faculty will work closely together to mentor students and coordinate the links between classes and the field experience to support the program themes.

The field experiences in the Collaborative Program will support our students learning to collaborate through placement arrangements. In several existing programs, we have placed students in schools in collaborative pairs, tailoring assignments and expectations to their working together to plan and implement instruction. Arrangements such as assigning a team of students to several classrooms in a school are being pursued. Students in the general education program will bring content expertise in different areas, depending on their liberal arts focus areas. This will provide a context for them to engage in interdisciplinary teaching within their field experience.

A third aspect of the redefining the partnerships between UWM and Milwaukee Public Schools is the joint involvement in creating program structures that are responsive to prospective teachers in the urban community. UWM is committed to identifying, recruiting, and supporting a diverse population of preservice teachers who in turn are committed to working collaboratively in urban schools with diverse learners. Often the individuals we wish to recruit are involved in the school system already, working as paraprofessionals or, particularly in special education and bilingual education, teaching with provisional licenses. Regarding paraprofessionals, two existing programs already link UWM and the Milwaukee Public Schools. Our commitment in this regard is to develop two different structures for delivering the same program: one for students who are working in the schools (or in other occupations), and one for students who attend during the day. We are convinced that the structures we develop must honor our commitment to high quality preparation, to an acknowledgment of the complexity of urban teaching, and to the varied range of experiences paraprofessionals bring to their preparation--some of which clearly strengthen their work and some which may demand relearning. Because the Collaborative Program is cohort based, we envision admitting what essentially will be a full time and a part-time cohort.

We also hope to coordinate MPS' hiring of provisionally licensed teachers with admission into UWM's certification programs, particularly in special and bilingual education. In large urban schools districts like Milwaukee, shortages of certified special education teachers result in the hiring of provisionally certified teachers, many of whom have little or no educational background. Provisionally certified teachers working full time in schools constitute a significant part of the student cohort in special education and will continue to do so. As part of our developing partnerships, we would like to increase the likelihood that those hired on provisional licenses are most likely to be responsive to the children's needs, to positively contribute to urban schools, and to remain in them. Rather than having teacher education program faculty become post hoc gatekeepers for those already provisionally hired, we hope to work together to take in those who are potentially the most promising from the outset simultaneously to their jobs and their teacher education programs.

Looking Toward the Future

At this point in our work, our commitment is high and we continue to be energized by the work, as difficult as it is. We have made decisions on some of the most challenging issues educators are facing. For example, we have reconceptualized the roles of both general and special education teachers, developing a new understanding of what it means to provide specialized teaching in relationship to new understandings of what general education teachers will do. We have opened the dialogue about urban teaching in a serious way, and are pressing this issue in more substantial ways than ever before. Faculty seem willing to engage in the most difficult aspects of the dialogue, namely, what it means to carry the themes across program elements that formerly were seen as "theirs alone." Although a core of faculty keep the effort moving, the level

of conversation within departments, across departments, and across education and liberal arts and sciences, is occurring at a higher level than ever before. Having come this far in the work of program development, we are getting a much deeper sense of what it means to change faculty norms and to teach in a co-responsible way and there is a real sense that faculty norms are in fact changing.

At the same time, the challenges ahead are becoming more and more obvious. Like our peers in teacher education across the country, we are trying to support junior faculty in the existing system while we internally are trying to change what it means to do the work of teacher education. We need to recognize that even though the pace of change ebbs and flows, the goal we are trying to achieve is what ought to keep us going. We need to understand that balancing the exciting work of conceptualizing the new program and the sometimes more pedestrian work of getting the details in place is part of the process of change. Other challenges arise as we begin to implement various parts of the program. For example, the range of students' background and educational experiences present a challenge in the special education certification program. The reality of urban schools at least for the foreseeable future is that we will always have provisionally certified teachers in special education with no prior background in education. The challenge is to clearly identify the general education base which these students need in order to be successful special education teachers and to design experiences from which they will develop this background. Finally, as faculty who are already teaming in special education are finding out, we recognize that our new roles will demand a different kind of time commitment. Redefining our work in the overall context of our School of Education and our university setting will make or break our progress.

How will we judge the success of our work? Clearly, it is in the success our students achieve as they cross the threshold of the schools in which they hold their first positions, and more importantly, the success of the children they teach. In urban districts the urgency of the situation is paramount. Our goal is that students in urban schools will complete their educations with the capacity to access whatever they need to make life successful. This will only occur if their teachers, whose preparation we broker, are clear in their understanding of the context in which their teaching occurs, are committed to working collaboratively to educate all learners, to make reasoned decisions regarding who does and does not have a disability, and can provide the highest quality of instruction. To make this happen, we as a teacher education faculty must require no less of ourselves.

Authors' Note

We would like to acknowledge our colleagues on the faculty in the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee who are engaged with us in building ***Collaborative Teacher Education for Urban Communities***. Additionally, we would like to acknowledge teachers and administrators in the Milwaukee Public Schools who have supported these efforts, as well as other community members who have worked with us.

AERA1.97/mcp
19 Mar 1997 / 12:43

Core Values for the Collaborative Teacher Education for Urban Communities Program

The first step in developing the program was to identify and carefully define the core values and core knowledge that would form the conceptual foundation for our work in teacher education. We spent a great deal of time on this task both in small groups and as a whole working group. We translated the **core values** into program themes; these themes serve as the anchors for our work and cross the four professional semesters. They include:

- valuing the child at the center of teaching
- valuing and promoting equity and the inclusion of diverse learners in the schools
- responsive, interactive teaching based upon sound content and pedagogical content knowledge
- collaboration among teachers, support staff, paraprofessionals, families, community agencies, and school administration
- caring and commitment to diverse student learners, to being advocates for children, to the cognitive development of all children, to diversity as an asset
- promoting reform by being actively involved in the process of change and advocating for improved education
- reflection as a professional stance, focus on improving one's practice through various forms of inquiry over the course of one's career
- integration across content areas, across levels of education, across developmental domains, and across field and academic experiences in the teacher education program

These core values are subsumed in the standards for teacher licensure on the following page.

Standards for Teacher Development and Licensure*

Early Childhood/Primary Middle	Special Education *(extending and focusing standards to address "what's special about special education?")*
#1: State of the art curriculum knowledge - understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) as the foundation for good teaching, and especially for good interdisciplinary teaching; can create learning experiences that make the subject matter meaningful for diverse learners; uses an approach that has a sound basis in literacy and mathematics as tool subjects.	***#1: Curriculum knowledge:*** understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of various discipline(s) and can adapt curriculum or design alternatives which are meaningful to learners with disabilities; uses an approach that has a sound basis in literacy and mathematics as tool subjects; understands and can use functional curriculum; career/vocational curriculum; conflict resolution based on individual student need.
#2: Foundations of learning and development as a basis for teaching - understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.	***#2: Foundations of learning and development:*** understands how children learn and develop; has in-depth knowledge about unique needs of learners with disabilities and works collaboratively–from a strengths-based versus a deficit model–to support their intellectual, social, and personal development.
#3: Accommodating diverse learners - understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.	***#3: Accommodating diverse learners:*** Creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners and assists colleagues in this process.
#4: State of the art instructional methodology - understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.	***#4: Instructional methodology:*** Understands and helps students apply tools such as strategic learning, assistive technology; uses "diagnostic" strategies which involve on-going, in-depth analysis of student learning and behavior to inform instruction; has well developed strategies to support successful participation in group and independent work.
#5: Creating and sustaining classrooms as communities - accepts all children, including those with disabilities; demonstrates an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	***#5: Classrooms as communities:*** has a strong repertoire of behavior management strategies which facilitate a sense of self-worth and self-control, social skill development, and positive peer relationships.
#6: Effective communication strategies - models and fosters effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.	***#6: Effective communication strategies:*** models and fosters effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom; addresses students' unique communication needs.
#7: Effective instructional planning - uses planning strategies based upon knowledge of the learners, subject matter, the community, and curriculum goals.	***#7: Effective instructional planning:*** has effective and manageable planning strategies, both short and long term; can provide leadership for collaboratively developing IEPs.
#8: Assessment strategies - identifies and values the knowledge, skills, and strengths learners already possess, uses formal and informal strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.	***#8: Assessment:*** identifies and values the knowledge, skills, and strengths learners already possess; uses in-depth assessment strategies of student learning/behavior and associated challenges; can provide leadership for assessment teams (e.g., multidisciplinary evaluation teams).
#9: Reflective practitioner, child advocate, and lifelong learner: is a thoughtful, inquiring professional, has a strong sense of advocacy for children and for creating positive futures, and has a commitment to lifelong learning.	***#9: Reflective practitioner, child advocate, and lifelong learner:*** is a thoughtful, inquiring professional, has a strong sense of advocacy for children and for creating positive futures, and has a commitment to lifelong learning.
#10: Collaboration - establishes strong working relationships with school colleagues, families, students, and agencies in the urban community to support students' learning and well-being.	***#10: Collaboration:*** establishes strong working relationships with school colleagues, families, students, and agencies in the urban community to support students' learning and well-being; works with other special education staff in the building to develop flexible and responsive services; provides direction and support to paraprofessionals.
#11: Social, philosophical, and cultural knowledge of schools as a basis for teaching - is culturally responsive and demonstrates a sound understanding of the urban context.	***#11: Social, philosophical, and cultural knowledge of schools as a basis for teaching:*** is culturally responsive and displays a sound understanding of the urban environment; understands the historical context, laws, and policies relevant to individuals with disabilities.

*Standards from: Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC 1992) as adapted in the Restructuring Teacher Education and Licensure in Wisconsin–Final Task Force report to WI DPI (April, 1995) and by UW-Milwaukee (Draft, June, 1996). *Teached.4 | STANDARD | 19 Mar 1997 / 11:47*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program Organization & Design Features

1. • ***Professional Blocks.*** The professional component of the program is delivered in four blocks, with each block building on the previous one. Drawing upon the work of Schwab's four common places, the interrelationships between the *child, content, context* and *teacher* are emphasized throughout the program. In each block, one or more of the "common places" are brought to the foreground to provide focus and continuity to the program's organization.

Block	Primary/Middle	Exceptional Education
Block I:	**Child at the Center**	**The Learner**
Block II:	*Interrelationships Between* **Content, Context,** *Child & Teacher*	**Content and Context**
Block III:	*Interrelationships Between* **Content, Context,** *Child & Teacher*	**Teacher: Defining Roles**
Block IV:	**Teacher - Defining Roles & Expanding Knowledge**	**Teacher: Expanding Knowledge**

Also the blocks are based on a career development perspective in that before leaving the program students begin to identify areas of special expertise and interest.

2. • ***Liberal Arts Foundation with Two Focus Areas.*** The professional blocks build upon a liberal arts foundation with two focus areas of study: *Mathematics* or *Science*; *Social Studies* or *Humanities and the Arts.*

3. • ***Recruitment, Admissions, Mentoring and Monitoring.*** In addition to an active recruitment–screening–admissions component, emphasis will be placed on mentoring students throughout the program. This will include pre-ed students who will receive advice and guidance in selecting their liberal arts focus areas and seeing the connection to the professional blocks.

4. • ***Field-based with Urban School Partnerships.*** Participants are enrolled in structured field experiences *throughout* the four professional blocks. Emphasis is placed on teaching in urban schools and within collaborative teaching structures. Appropriate accommodations will be made for participants who are enrolled in internship programs or are employed as a teaching assistant or provisionally licensed teacher. Through the ongoing development of partnerships with urban schools, participants will learn from exemplary practices and supportive collaborative relationships with parents and educators in partnership schools.

5. • ***Student Cohorts and Faculty Teams.*** Participants are admitted in a cohort of 20-25 students based on their certification area, i.e., unified early childhood or primary/middle. This cohort model allows a group of students to experience much of the program together, and thus make greater use of an invaluable resource, i.e., fellow students. Faculty members work in teams to coordinate program development and support cohorts. These teams bring together faculty from various disciplines and thus, strengthen our ability to draw curriculum connections, coordinate syllabi and model collaborative relationships. Faculty teams will include ad hoc faculty and/or "teachers in residence" from area school districts.

6. • ***Linking Seminars.*** Seminars are scheduled each semester to facilitate inquiry, reflection, analysis, and integration of major learning experiences. The linking seminar ensures program integrity by connecting the content of courses and field experiences to the core themes of the program and the overarching goals of each semester.

7. • ***Portfolio Development.*** Overall measures of teaching expertise will be reviewed each semester based on field experience and associated projects. Each block has designated projects that will need to be successfully completed (as part of the field experience or coursework) and integrated into several stages of portfolios: Beginning; Professional Growth; and Showcase Portfolios.

8. • ***Summer Institute or Academic Year Option.*** Participants can enroll in a full-time, Academic Year Option, or a Summer Institute Option which allows for the completion of the professional blocks in a two-year time frame while being employed in a role that meets the teaching experience requirements.

9. • ***Program Steering Group to Ensure Ongoing Evaluation and Development.*** The ongoing development and evaluation of the Collaborative Teacher Education Program will be guided by a steering group made up of an interdisciplinary group of faculty, students and school partners. This group will "steer" the implementation of program, facilitate an ongoing evaluation and refinement process, and ensure that flexibility and ongoing development occur within the new structure.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Emerging
Coordinating
Structure
Draft...2/97

Collaborative Teacher Education Program for Urban Communities

Early Childhood --- Primary/Middle
Early Childhood-Special Education Primary/Middle Special Education Bilingual/ESL